DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 352 679 CS 213 648

AUTHOR Kooy, Mary
TITLE Reading and Writing the "Lived-through Experience": Examining the Developing Responses of Adolescents to Three Novels.
PUB DATE Dec 92
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Reading Conference (42nd, San Antonio, TX, December 2-5, 1992).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adolescent Literature; *Adolescents; English Instruction; Foreign Countries; Grade 9; *Literature Appreciation; *Novels; *Reader Response; Secondary Education
IDENTIFIERS Aesthetic Reading; Canada; Reading Logs; *Response to Literature; Writing Contexts

ABSTRACT

A study explored the developing literacy response of adolescents through writing by investigating three characteristics: patterns, individual variations, and the effects of genre on response. Subjects, 7 grade nine students from a small private secondary school on the west coast of Canada, were selected for their wide reading experiences. Subjects read Robert Cormier's "I am the Cheese," Alice Childress' "A Hero Ain't Nothin' but a Sandwich," and Ursula Le Guin's "A Wizard of Earthsea" and recorded their responses in a reading log. Reading logs were transcribed and analyzed. Results indicated that: (1) personal response, character and/or event analysis, sense-making, and retelling were the predominant responses for each novel; (2) evidence of individual variations in response emerged clearly; and (3) individual readers responded differently not only from each other, but also from one novel to the other. Findings suggest that the subjects engaged more personally, fully and knowledgeably in the literary experience and that the reading log is effective in enhancing literary response. (Four tables of data are included; a reading response log guide, a description of the categories of reader response, a list of response descriptors generated, and 35 references are attached.) (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Mary Kooy

READING AND WRITING THE "LIVED-THROUGH EXPERIENCE:" EXAMINING THE DEVELOPING RESPONSES OF ADOLESCENTS TO THREE NOVELS

ED352679

Rosenblatt first proposed restoring the reader to the reading event in her seminal work, Literature as Exploration in 1938. More recent research in reading, response, psycholinguistics and schema (Smith, 1973; Purves and Beach, 1973; Bleich, 1975; Squire, 1978; Cooper and Odell, 1978; Applebee, 1981) confirms the influence of the reader's frame of reference, the "behind the eyeball" contributions. It is the reader guided by the text who puzzles, assembles, and orders the reading experience. Although sometimes accused of relinquishing the text in favour of the reader, response theorists generally promote personal but active, controlled and defensible readings.

Responding to literature through writing has long been an established tradition in secondary English classes, generally through comprehension questions and literary essays. That appears to play short shrift to the power of writing as a tool for thinking (Vygotsky, 1962; Polanyi, 1969; Bruner, 1960; Emig, 1983; Berthoff, 1981, 1984). Some research indicates that literary response may, in fact, develop similarly to the writing process (Pearson and Tierney, 1983; Britton, 1982; Petroskey, 1982). Writing that serves to explore the experience of literature, remains scant.Yet writing that serves to explore the experience of literature, remains scant. In addition, a symbiotic relationship appears to exist between reading and writing; the one informing and reflecting the other (Birnbaum, 1986; Berthoff, 1983;Salvatori, 1983; Squire, 1987).

Personal, expressive writing in response to literature is beginning to gain acceptance (Buckler, 1985; Flynn, 1983; Cookston, 1982). Generally, however, such writings focus on personal response that turns inward; the reading becomes a springboard for associated links to personal experiences. Consequently, the text recedes into the distant background. The present study aimed to keep the literary text central in the response process. Moreover, while most response studies focus on poetry (Dias, 1987, for instance) and short stories (Squire, 1964;

CS213648

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Mary Kooy
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Mary Kooy, Ph.D.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Purves and Rippere, 1968), this study examined the responses of adolescents while they read extended literary texts (novels).

This study explores the developing literary responses of adolescents through writing by investigating three characteristics: patterns, individual variations and the effects of genre on response.

THE DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Seven Grade 9 students read three novels: I Am the Cheese, A Hero Ain't Nothin' But a Sandwich, and A Wizard of Earthsea. Without any previous knowledge or discussion regarding the novel, students read and recorded their responses in a log. Only global, general directions were provided (Appendix A).

After students had completed the reading, I read and responded to the content, creating a dialogue with the responder ("Can you answer this question now?" "I never thought of this before," "I wonder why?"). Discussion of the first novel with the other readers - using the Response Log - ensued. Response to the process of reading, writing in the response log and discussion followed. The subsequent two novels were read similarly; I responded in the logs though no group discusssions followed.

The seven students were interviewed using a general questionnaire that focused on the response process, the role of writing, the effect of the discussion of I Am the Cheese using the logs,and a comparison of the novels. Before the final interview, the students reread their logs and commented orally where appropriate. The comments were noted on the interview sheets.

THE COMPONENTS OF THE STUDY

Participants

Seven Grade 9 students were drawn from a small private secondary school on the west coast of Canada. Twelve students volunteered; seven (five girls and two boys) were selected for their wide reading experiences. All seven were in the top "stream" of their class and earned A's and B's in English.

Novels

Adolescent characters, appropriate complexity for capable readers, distinct literary characteristics and potential for eliciting a variety of responses characterized the three selected novels.

Cormier's complex I Am the Cheese reveals the narrative through three separate, but tightly interwoven strands. Each strand reveals small components of Adam's. The unusual structure and content confuses and gripps the reader. A Hero Ain't Nothin' But a Sandwich by Alice Childress exposes Benjie's inner city world of slums and drug abuse through eleven first-person "voices". In Le Guin's fantasy, A Wizard of Earthsea, young Sparrowhawk receives the gift of wizardry, abuses it and is consequently haunted by a nameless "shadow" who must be confronted to be overcome. The traditional narrative is rich in symbolic and poetic language.

PROCEDURES

After reading small portions (five to ten pages) of each novel, students recorded their responses in a reading log: questions, predictions, reflections, observations and connections. No length limits or specific questions were prescribed. Reading and responding took approximately two weeks per novel. For purposes of analysis, each Response Log statement was transcribed and numbered.

MEASURES

Purves and Rippere's Elements of Literary Response

The Purves and Rippere instrument (Appendix B) incorporates five general categories of response: Engagement/ involvement; perception; interpretation; evaluation and miscellaneous. Each category is further divided into specific elements. Although designed to analyze responses written after the reading, the non-hierarchical elements provide a range of possible choices for describing response statements. For the purpose of this study, only the five general categories were applied.

Response Descriptors for Written Responses

Twenty-five response descriptors, not hierarchical in order, were developed from the response logs to characterize both the nature of the ongoing, developing response and the textual characteristics of the novels (Appendix C). Interrater reliability testing revealed an eighty percent agreement.

RESULTS

The reading logs revealed a diverse range of responses, observations and insights into the novels. Students appeared to engage more personally and fully with the reading. The language of the reading logs demonstrated evidence of thinking and reflecting - of transacting with the literary text - not found in traditional written or oral questions following the reading of several chapters. Students expressed their feelings, understandings, frustrations, and questions. Sometimes they became dogged about resolving a problem as Grant's response demonstrates:

> I've finished the book. It's driving me crazy. I can't figure out if the bike riding was present or past. If its present it doesn't make sense. This book is interesting, I would like to look into it more. I half to find the answer.

The findings focus on four areas of response to the three literary works: (1) patterns, (2) individual variations, and (3) the effects of genre.

A. Patterns of Response

A pattern suggests regularity, typicality and recurrence. The Purves and Rippere categories, a framework sufficiently broad for suggesting characteristic recurring, was applied to each response statement. Table 1 summarizes the findings.

TABLE 1

PURVES AND RIPPERE CATEGORIES OF RESPONSE

Descriptor	Percentage of Response Statements I am the Cheese	A Hero Ain't Nothin' But a Sandwich	A Wizard of Earthsea
Engagement	13.9	24.6	37.8
Perception	58.0	39.0	38.8
Interpretation	22.2	31.0	19.2
Evaluation	2.2	5.0	3.0
Miscellaneous	3.7	.4	1.2

Table 1 reveals several characteristics of the novel responses. I am the Cheese responses appear to focus on perception (58%) and to a lesser degree, interpretation (22.2%). Not surprisingly, questions occurred more frequently at the beginning of the reading. Annette's opening response is typical: "The first chapter leaves me with lots of questions like: Why is the father in the hospital? How old is he, and what's his name? What do the tapes mean and why are they used?"

Responses to the remaining two novels focussed approximately 20% less on perception (39% and 38.8% as opposed to 58%). Moreover, personal response increased for each of the novels moving from 13.9% for I am the Cheese to 37.8% of the responses for A Wizard of Earthsea.

I Am the Cheese, a complex, interwoven text, proved challenging to the students. Expressions of uncertainty [perception] surfaced frequently. Marleen began her response:

> I don't understand why the boy is leaving and where from? [perception] I think the tapes were of Adam talking to a psychiatrist about his life. [perception] What were the pills he threw away? [perception] I noticed that the boy is weird. [engagement] I wonder what the package to his father is? [perception] What year is this story written in? [perception] [Statements 1-6]

Responses to A Hero Ain't Nothin' but a Sandwich represented a more even distribution: perception responses (39%), interpretive responses (31%) and personal responses (24.6%).

Response to this novel included the highest incidence of interpretive reflections. A one-fifth decrease in the perception responses resulted in an increase in personal and interpretive responses. Frequently, students became deeply involved in Benjie's life:

> When I found out that the boy was a real drug addict, it upset me. I hate kids who ruin their lives like that. The kid doesn't even notice that he has a problem. [Grant, lines 2-4]]
>
> I feel sorry for Bernard Cohen, the white teacher. Maybe its because I'm white too, but it seems that he just tries to mind his own business, but other teachers still hassle him. I think Nigeria Greene is too strong. [Annette, lines 15-17]

Another change occurred for the reading A Wizard of Earthsea. While the decrease in perception responses remained almost equal, personal responses increased (from 24.6% to 37.8%). Interpretive responses, on the other hand, fell from 31% to 19.2%.

Although responses often reflected similarities, students did not move through each category before moving on but rather, wove them in and out reflexively. The opening of Jessica's journal characterizes the flux:

> This book seems pretty strange because it starts in slang and black language and it gets more normal. [engagement-involvement] It must be strange for the author to write. [engagement-involvement] The language makes it easier to understand Benjie's point of view. [interpretation] The way he tells things you can almost understand why he started doing drugs when his life is the way it is. [engagement-involvement] I wonder if he OD's or if he "kicks"? [perception]

Distribution of responses reveals a distinct focus on perception for I am the Cheese, and a more diverse response for A Hero Ain't Nothin' but a Sandwich (ranging from 24.6% to 39% for personal engagement , interpretation and perception). Two responses emerged almost equally for A Wizard of Earthsea: personal engagement (37.8%) and perception (38.8%). The predominant, recurring responses suggest that patterns of response exist, but each novel assumed a distinct pattern.

Table 1 indicates a clustering of responses suggesting a general pattern for each novel. To gain additional insight, predominant responses were examined. Response descriptors (Appendix C) were assigned to each response statement and/ or questions. At times, a statement included more than one descriptor: a question with an implicit hypothesis could also be an attempt at trying to make sense of the content (Tentative frameworking/ "sense making"). Table 2 indicates the predominant responses for all three novels.

Table 2

Predominant Responses: Averages for three novels
Total Statements = 1538

Response Descriptor	Percentage of Response Statements
Personal Response and Engagement	15.3
Character and Event Analysis	14.3
Tentative Frameworking and "Sense making"	11.3
Retelling and Narration	8.9
Questions	8.3

Analysis revealed that on the whole, personal response and engagement with the novel predominated. Compared to Table 1 using the Purves and Rippere categories, it appears that a different emphasis occurs using the response descriptors. However, the perception category includes such descriptors as tentative frameworking and "sense making" and questions (a total of 25.9%); hence, the two support each other. Taken together, the five responses listed in Table 2 emerged in 76.8% of the total response statements.

Considered individually, the novel responses revealed a slightly different picture. Four responses predominated for each novel: Personal Response and Engagement, Analysis of Characters and Events, Tentative Frameworking/ Sense-making, and Retelling.

Table 3

PREDOMINANT RESPONSES: THREE NOVELS

1. I Am the Cheese [statements = 540]
2. A Hero Ain't Nothin' but a Sandwich [statements = 525
3. A Wizard of Earthsea [statements = 572]

Response Descriptor	Percentage of Total Responses		
	Novel 1	Novel 2	Novel 3
Tentative Frameworking/ Sense-making	16.5	7.8	9.6
Questions - Direct	15.5	—	8.3
Questions - implicit hypothesis	11.6	—	—
Analysis: Character/ Event	10.8	20.3	11.9
Retelling	8.1	12.2	8.9
Insight/ Understanding	7.9	—	–
Personal Response/ Engagement	6.1	17.8	22.1
Evaluation/ Judgment: Character/ Event	—	9.2	—

As Table 3 indicates, each novel prompted different predominant responses. I Am the Cheese responses focused on four types of responses that indicate uncertainty, hypothesizing and character analysis. Readers responded to A Hero Ain't Nothin' but a Sandwich through character and event analysis and personal response. A Wizard of Earthsea responses were characterized primarily by personsal engagement witht the text. This confirms the general categories established for each of the novels presented in Table 1.

B. Individual Response Variations

Although common predominant responses emerged for the group as a whole, individual responses varied; at times, substantially. Table 4 presents individual variations in response to each novel.

The novels will be discussed individually.

TABLE 4

Individual Responses

1. I Am the Cheese [statements = 540]

Response		Percentage of Response Statements						
		Grant	Jessica	Annette	Tracey	Marleen	Miranda	Gordon
Tentative Frameworking	14.1	17.6	17.4	11.5	12.2	19.5	23.1	
Questions: (Direct)		18.8	18.8	20.3	14.4	6.1	12.2	18.0
Questions: (Hypothesis)	10.6	5.9	7.2	6.7	12.2	14.6	24.0	
Analysis: Char./ Event	20.0	8.2	2.9	11.5	14.3	10.6	8.2	
Retelling		1.2	0	4.3	35.6	0	13.8	1.6
Insight/ Understanding	14.1	7.1	14.5	4.8	8.2	4.1	2.5	
Personal Response/ Engagement		8.2	5.9	7.2	2.9	15.3	.8	2.5

Comparing individual responses for I Am the Cheese revealed a range for each predominant response. Those in closest range are represented in the "tentative frameworking" statements (ranging from 11.5% to 23.1%). Gordon spent almost two-thirds of his responses (65.1%) in relative uncertainty: asking questions and tentatively trying to make sense of the novel. Retelling characterized Tracey's responses (35.6%). Grant (20%) and Marleen (14.3%) analyzed characters and events. Marleen responded more personally to the novel than the other readers. Nevertheless, as could be expected, common factual information surfaced; virtually all students mentioned the tapes, two birth certificates and "clues" in the novel, for instance.

Several changes occurred in the responses to A Hero Ain't Nothin' But a Sandwich. Predominant responses occurred in a different order and questioning played no significant role in the response. Personal response became the second most predominant response although Tracey's proved marginal. Retelling for the first novel (35%) was replaced with analysis of characters and events (34.6%). On the other hand, retelling increased for Miranda and Gordon, moving from 13.8% to 27& and increased her from 1.6% to 38%, respectively. Only Annette

continued tentatively frameworking and making sense of the novel. Unique to responses to this novel are the judgments and evaluations of the characters and events that each reader engaged in.

Some students began reading LeGuin's fantasy, A Wizard of Earthsea with pleasure ("This book seems very interesting"); others with some reservation ("I think I won't like this book probably. I hate science fiction."). Understandably, variations in individual responses emerged again. Questions constituted 36.7% of Gordon's response; the remaining six students, 3.5%. Consequently, questions became a predominant response for this novel on the basis of one student's response (an obvious outlier). Personal response and engagement was the predominant response for four readers; Marleen shared it almost equally with analysis of characters and events. Relative to the other readers, Gordon engaged only minimally on a personal level with the novel (1.2%). Retelling shifted to Annette and Tracey; Miranda's retelling remained fairly constant throughout the three novels.

Across the three novels, personal response and engagement increased for Grant, Jessica, Annette and Miranda. Tracey's jumped from 2.9% and 1.3% for the first two novels to 23.4% for the third. Gordon's personal response rose for the second and declined again for the third (2.5%, 8.5% and 1.2%, respectively).

C. The Effects of Narrative Structure on Response

Identifying the predominant responses for each novel highlights some characteristic responses for each of the novels (Table 1). Table 4 reveals the responses characteristic of each of the novels, highlighting both response similarities and differences. As Table 3 indicates, a different hierarchy of predominant responses emerged for each of the novels.

I Am the Cheese responses were characterized by two responses that proved inconsequential for the other two novels: Questions ("How come he's so scared when he finds he has two birth certificates? Does he have certain really bad memories from childhood?") and expressions of understanding ("As Adam finds clues, you then find the clues as the story is

pieced together"). Expressions of uncertainty in the three most common responses constituted 43.6% of all the responses.

Analysis of characters and events and personal and response and engagement characterized the responses to this novel. The uncertainty evident in I Am the Cheese was replaced by analysis of characters and events and more personal response. Judgment of characters and events emerged predominantly (9.2%) only for this novel. One student wrote: "His step-father seems to be nice, concerned, loving man who sees that his stepson has a problem. The grandmother seems to be a hyper religious fanatic."

The greatest levels of personal response appeared in response to A Wizard of Earthsea. Almost one-fourth of the responses (22.1%) expressed personal engagement as the following quote demonstrates:

> This was intriguing and I was really into it, but right in the middle I thought - 'this is so unrealistic' but I still am engrossed by what's happening & I can't figure out why.

The different hierarchies of predominant responses and the individual variations in the responses to each novel indicate that literary structure appears to influence response. The characteristic responses for each novel is consistent with the familiarity students appear to have with the structure and content of each novel.

DISCUSSION

A. Patterns of Response

Broadly defined, patterns of response can be found in recurrence and typicality. General patterns occurred in the readings of the three novels confirming the work of Squire (1964) who found that certain patterns of response emerged in the oral protocols he collected. The students in this study patterned their responses globally. Some types of responses recurred for all three novels. This may be due, in part, to learned responses (Purves, 1981). Sequential or hierarchical response patterns were not evident in the reading logs: that is, students did not move through the categories of response in a definitive or predictable order. Perhaps due to the expressive nature of the response log, students moved freely and reflexively as the thoughts occurred. It

may also be due to the act of writing, a slower and more intentional process than talking. Nevertheless, response to the novels demonstrated recurring responses that created a general pattern.

Four responses occurred predominantly for each novel: personal response, character and/or event analysis, sense-making and retelling. Unlike any of the other types of responses, personal response increased for each novel read. Why? The ordering of the novels or the opportunity for free response may have contributed. Perhaps prior expectations of what constitutes literary response (Purves, 1981) may have had an effect. Moreover, the content, characters and structure of the narratives may have played a role. The structure of I Am the Cheese digressed considerably from the typical reading experiences of these adolescents and may have forced attention on constructing meaning of the content and structure rather than allowing a response on a more personal level.

Rosenblatt's concept that a transaction with literature encourages personal response emerged in the student responses. Jessica stated: "The way the author wrote the stuff he said, it seemed like a black guy
was sitting right next to you and you're just listening to him." Perhaps the informal nature of the reading log encouraged more personal, reflective responses. Students felt they had permission to engage and respond to the literature.

The frequent analysis of the characters and events indicates that these students possess considerable literary knowledge (Birnbaum, 1986). No stock responses emerged; rather, students recorded their impressions and understandings as Marleen's response indicates: "Vetch sounds like a nice guy - someone you can become close friends to. But Jasper is another story. He acts like a stuck-up snob. He always seems to want to get the better of Ged" (A Wizard of Earthsea). Increase in both analysis of the characters and events and personal response revealed in the second and third novels may suggest a relationship between the two. Through attending more to the actions and circumstances of the characters, students may also become more personally involved in the literature.

Attempts to make sense of the novel clearly characterized the responses. Research indicates that learning involves taking risks, testing hypotheses and connecting relevant information. The Reading Response Logs gave students opportunities to do that as the following quote from a student interview demonstrates: "In I Am the Cheese I had lots of questions and I wasn't sure how to do this [reading response log] but it worked - the questions were answered."

Retelling constituted the fourth predominant response. Squire explained the purpose of "narrational reactions" as a technique used "when the reader has difficulty in comprehending" (1964, 17). Three students frequently retold the narrative, but claimed to do so for different reasons: "so that I can note it like, 'Yeah, that's what I was talking about';" "to restate your thinking;" and "to get the writing going."

B. Individual Response Variations

Evidence of individual variations in response emerged clearly. Research indicates that a reader's "schema" or "scripts" bear directly on literary experiences. As individuals routinely respond differently to the same event - a movie, for instance - readers also respond uniquely to literary texts. The logs also demonstrate what Drucker termed, "selective attention" - heeding to some details or important parts while ignoring others. Each reader selected particular dimensions of the novel to reflect on. Perhaps the act of writing and being able to re-view earlier responses encourages readers to pursue a train of thought. As a result, the act of writing cannot claim a comprehensiveness. The mind moves faster than the hand; consequently, readers cannot accurately capture their complete thoughts on paper. Nevertheless, writing offers a partial representation of a reader's response.

First, individual readers filter literary texts through their own reading framework: their backgrounds, personalities and reading experiences. Second, the complexity of the reading act itself may be responsible; many processes need to operate simultaneously. Moreover, little is known about the strategies used by successful readers. Finally, the expressive nature of the ongoing response encourages readers to experiment, risk, change interpretations and add information.

C. The Effects of Narrative Structure on Response

Rosenblatt holds that distinct literary texts call upon different knowledge. A Jacobsen study found that "some texts provide more `reader cues' and invite more engagement and response than the less accessible texts" (cited in Beach, 1985, 123). The study seems to confirm this finding. I Am the Cheese responses revealed uncertainty and attempts to make sense of the novel. Responses to A Hero Ain't Nothin' But a Sandwich focused on analyzing Benjie and his circumstances. Most readers engaged most personally with A Wizard of Earthsea, the most familiar genre of the three novels and the third novel to be read. Individual readers responded differently not only from each other, but also from one novel to the other.

Different patterns emerged from the readings of each of the novels. Hence, general patterns may be explained by the distinct nature of the novels. For each novel, particular responses predominated. This supports Rosenblatt's assertion that the text plays a dynamic role in the reading event.

The questionnaire revealed that although students found the log "a bit of a pain at times" because of the "constant interruptions it caused," they recognized the benefits of writing. One student observed that the log "served as something to extend my thinking. It was a way of writing down things I didn't understand."

IMPLICATIONS FOR LEARNING AND TEACHING

What made the reading log effective in enhancing literary response for these students? Response to literature requires active reading that teaches students how to think, monitor the process, and afford opportunities to express substiated interpretations using both the text and their lives (Petrosky, 1982).

One effective heuristic for tapping benefits from the literary experience is through writing - a problem-solving, meaning-making activity (Britton, 1970; Emig, 1977; Berthoff, 1981). The written responses make explicit the developing, pre-critical response (Ronald, 1986).

Responding through writing requires students to express a personal perceptions. Used appropriately, this develops both abilities to respond and confidence in a personal response

through active transaction with the literary work. The reading response log provides a purpose for writing, a strong motivator for meaningful language (Barr, 1985). Moreover, using writing to actively construct a "web of meaning" (Berthoff's term) avoids the often stilted and artificial writing found in traditional essays.

Using writing to gauge the developing response allows both students and their teachers to become aware, in a concrete manner, of the process of response. As the medium for critical reading, writing offers a tangible way for tentative, plan-altering meaning construction (Hunt, 1982). For teachers, the Reading Response Log provides a window on the minds of students that informs the subsequent class experiences of the novel.

Since reading and writing appear to reflect upon each other, writing during the reading actively promotes dependence and influence of one upon the other. Both Salvatori (1983) and Flynn (1983) view expressive writing as the reading/writing link.

Active learning requires taking risks, testing hypotheses and formulating and altering the meaning of the text for the reader. Students learn not only what to think, but how to think "by asking questions that demand not just recall but higher-level reasoning and predicting and by sometimes demonstrating reflective reading and writing behaviors" (Rosenblatt, 1985, 42).

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The adolescents in this study recorded their ongoing responses to three novels while they read. As the evidence portrays, they appeared to engage more personally, fully and knowledgeably in the experience. The language of the reading logs were characterized by a tenuousness and sense of discovery generally associated with the gradual and acculumulative process of learning. This represents the first study to examine the ongoing, written responses of adolescents to novels before any discussions of the novel transpired.

Numerous questions remain. Would other means of determining response reap helpful data about the processes and strategies of literary response? What effect would the expressive, ongoing writing during the reading have on subsequent formal writing? On classroom discussion? What is the nature of the apparent symbiotic relationship between reading and

writing? What reading strategies glean the most comprehensive response? How would larger samples, different populations and novels affect the results?

The students in this study, through recording their ongoing responses, contributed appreciably to their literature learning and enhanced their abilities as capable, critical, response-able readers of literary texts.

APPENDIX A

READING RESPONSE LOG GUIDE

A response journal is one effective way to keep a log of your responses. It offers a chance to think about your reading, to ask questions, to wonder ALOUD, so to speak, about the novel. During your reading, take some time every 5 - 10 pages to record your observations. This is not a time to "tell" what happens in the story but a time to ponder on how what happens strikes you.

Your responses will almost certainly vary in length. Sometimes you may want to write half a page, other times three or four lines. Neatness is only limited to readability. Do not rewrite or revise your responses. The main idea is to record your first impressions.

The following thoughts offer possibilities for responding. Don't use them as questions to answer. Use them only as "prompts" to get started if you wish.

SUGGESTIONS FOR RESPONSE:

1. In this section, I was impressed or struck by . . . .
2. I noticed . . . . .
3. I wonder about . . . . .
4. I predict. . . . . .
5. I have a question about . . . . .
6. I don't understand. . . . .
7. I now understand . . . .
8. An interesting word, sentence, thought from the text is. . .
9. Something I like/ don't like about _____ (character)
10. I really enjoy/ don't enjoy. . . . .

These are only suggestions. If something strikes you, include it in your log. Do not limit yourself to the suggestions listed above. Each person responds to a text in different ways. The purpose of this journal is not to test your knowledge, but to help you express your response in a personal way.

APPENDIX B

PURVES AND RIPPERE:
ELEMENTS OF WRITING ABOUT A LITERARY WORK

100 - ENGAGEMENT/ INVOLVEMENT

This category involves such items as reaction to the literature, author or form, retelling in a different form, moral reaction to characters/ incidents, relating incidents to the reader's life.

200 - PERCEPTION

Responses to the novel including comprehension, literary devices, content, structure, plot, objective perception, subject matter, setting, or point of view, for instance.

300 - INTERPRETATION

This category includes responses that require inferences about past or present, setting or author, character analysis, ethical interpretations, or style.

400 - EVALUATION

This category includes such items as affective evaluation, author's method or vision, imagination, thematic importance, or moral significance and acceptability.

APPENDIX C

RESPONSE DESCRIPTORS FOR WRITTEN RESPONSES

A.	Personal Response/ Engagement (" I am afraid for Adam")
B.	Narration/ Retelling
C.	Knowledge Gaps ("I don't understand")
D.	Confusion ("I am confused about the time in this story")
E.	Questions - simple, direct ("What are these pills that he takes?")
F.	Questions - implicit hypothesis ("Is this why he...?")
G.	Reflection ("I wonder" "I think")
H.	Prediction ("I predict Ged will defeat the shadow")
I.	Confirmation ("I knew he wouldn't.....")
J.	Tentative Frameworking/ "Sense making" ("seems like...")
K.	Insight/ Understanding ("Wow! Now it makes sense that....")
L.	Striking impression/ View/ Picture/ Event
M.	Unexpected Finding ("I never expected that the man in grey...")
N.	Analysis of Characters/ Events ("He seems so shy")
O.	Judgment/ Evaluation of Characters/ Events ("I hate kids who....")
P.	Prescription/ Advice for Characters
Q.	Textual Language - words, phrases, quotes
R.	Textual Structure - literary elements, design
S.	Textual Concepts/ Ideas/ Themes ("good vs. evil")
T.	Comparison to other Literary Texts ("This is like I read....")
U.	Projection/ Application - to the larger, outside world
V.	Author's Method/ Style/ Process
W.	Miscellaneous

Bibliography

Applebee, A.N. (1981). Writing in the Secondary School: English and the Content Areas. Urbana, Ill.: NCTE.

Barr, Mary.(1985). "Language and Learning: From Research into Secondary School Practice." New York University. Unpublished paper.

Beach, Richard. (1985). "Discourse Conventions and Researching Response to Literary Dialogue." In Researching Response to Literature and the Teaching of Literature: Points of Departure. Charles Cooper (Ed.), Norwood, N.J.: Ablex, 103-127.

Berthoff, Ann E. (1983). "The Intelligent Eye and the Thinking Hand." In The Writer's Mind: Writing as a Mode of Thinking. Urbana, Ill., NCTE., 191-196.

Birnbaum, J.C. (1986). "Reflective Thought: The Connections Between Reading and Writing." In Convergences: Transactions in Reading and Writing. Irbana, Ill.: NCTE, 30-45.

Britton, James. (1970). Language and Learning. Harmondsworth, England, Penguin.

Buckler, Patricia Prandini. (1985). "Reading, Writing and Psycholinguistics: An Integrated Approach Using Joyce's Counterparts." In Teaching English in the Two-Year College, 12(1), 22-31.

Cookston, Diane. "This Guy Can Really Write." In Mary Barr (Ed.). (1982). What's Going On? Language/ Learning Episodes in British and American Classrooms, Grades 4-13. Upper Montclair, N.J.: Boynton/Cook, 196-217.

Berthoff, Ann E. (1981). The Making of Meaning: Metaphors, Models and Maxims for Writing Teachers. Montclair, N.J: Boynton/ Cook.

Bleich, David. Readings and Feelings: An Introduction to Subjective Criticism. Urbana, Ill.: NCTE, 1975.

Britton, James. (1982). Prospect and Retrospect: Selected Essays of James Britton. G. Pradl, (Ed.). London: Heinemann, 1982.

Bruner, Jerome. (1982). The Proces of Education. 3rd Ed. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Buckler, Patricia Prandini. (1985). "Reading, Writing and Psycholinguistics: An Integrated Approach Using Joyce's Counterparts." In Teaching English in the Two-Year College, 12(1), 22-31.

Cookston, Diane. "This Guy Can Really Write." In Mary Barr (Ed.). (1982). What's Going On? Language/ Learning Episodes in British and American Classrooms, Grades 4-13. Upper Montclair, N.J.: Boynton/Cook, 196-217.

Cooper, Charles, & Odell, Lee (Ed.). (1978). Research on Composing: Points of Departure. Urbana, Ill.: NCTE.

Dias, Patrick. (1987). Making Sense of Poetry: Patterns in the Process. Ottawa: CCTE.

Hunt, Russel A. & Vipond, Douglas. (1985). "Crash–Testing a Transactional Model of Literary Learning." In Reader, 14, 23–39.

Pearson, P. David, Robert J. Tierney. (1983). "Toward a Composing Model of Reading." In Language Arts, 60, 568–580.

Petrosky, Anthony R. (1982). "From Story to Essay: Reading and Writing." In College Composition and Communication, 33(1), 19–36.

Peyton, Joy Kreeft, & Seyoum, Mulugetta. (1989). "The Effect of Teacher Strategies on Students' Interactive Writing: The Case of Dialogue Journals." In Research in the Teaching of English, 23(3), 310–334.

Peyton, Joy Kreeft. (1988). "Dialogue Writing – Bridge from Talk to Essay." In J. Staton, R. Shuy, J. Peyton, L. Reed, Dialogue Journal Communication: Classroom, Linguistic,Social and Cognitive Views, Norwood, N.J.: Ablex, 88–106.

Polanyi, Michael. (1969). Knowing and Being: Essays by Michael Polanyi. Ed. Marjorie Greene. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Purves, Alan C., V. Rippere. (1968). Elements of Writing About a Literary Work: A Study of Response to Literature. NCTE Research Report, no.9. Urbana, Ill.: NCTE.

Purves, Alan C., Beach, R. (1973). Literature and the Reader: Research in Response to Literature, Reading Interests and the Teaching of Literature. Urbana, Ill.: NCTE.

Purves, A.C. (1981). Reading and Literature: American Achievement in International Perspective. Urbana, Ill.: NCTE.

Ronald, K. (1986). "The Self and the Other in the Process of Composing: Implications for Reading and Writing." In Convergences: Transactions in Reading and Writing. Bruce T. Petersen, Ed., Urbana, Ill.: NCTE.

Rosenblatt, Louise M. (1938). Literature as Exploration. New York: Noble and Noble.

Rosenblatt, Louise. M. (1985). "The Transactional Theory of the Literary Work: Implications for Research." In Researching Response to Literature and the Teaching of Literature. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex, 35-53.

Salvatori, Mariolina. (1983). "Reading and Writing a Text: Correlations Between Reading and Writing." In College English, v.7, 657-666.

Staton, J., Shuy, R., Peyton, J., & Reed, L. Dialogue Journal Communication: Classroom, Linguistic, Social and Cognitive Views. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.

Smith, Frank. (1973). Psycholinguistics and Reading. New York: Holt, Rhinehart and Winston.

Squire, James. (1964). The Responses of Adolescents While Reading Four Short Stories. Champaigne, Ill.: NCTE.

Squire, James. (1978). Response to Literature. Cghampaign, Ill.: NCTE.

Squire, James, Ed. (1987). The Dynamics of Language Learning: Research in Reading and English. National Conference on Research in English. Urbana, Ill.: Eric Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills.

Vygotsky, Lev. (1962). Thought and Language. Ed. and transl. by E.Hanfmann and G. Vakars [1934], Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.